

networkMaryland Advisory Group
Monthly Meeting
July 15, 2003, 9:00 am – 12:30 pm
45 Calvert Street
Annapolis, Maryland

ADVISORY GROUP ATTENDEES:

Ellis Kitchen
Greg McKibbin
Pat Wallace
Renee Winsky
Chuck Bristow
Barb Pivec
Will Morrow

Susan Ockert
Steve Molnar
Richard Aldridge
Jem Pagan (for Judi Wood)
Richard Rose
Mike McCarty

DBM ATTENDEES:

Mary Ann Slack
Jason Ross
Bill Dye
Tim Kwong
Joanne Rusk

ENGINEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Ron Ward

GUESTS:

Amy DeMarco, Cisco Systems
Rob Dallas, Marconi
Jason Kwolek, Marconi

Reported By:	Presentation Topics	Comments and Actions	Completion
M. Slack	Call to Order –The meeting was called to order at 9:10 am		
Members	Approval of June Minutes- Welcomed new State Government Representative – Greg McKibbin, MDE	June minutes were approved with no changes.	
E. Kitchen	Project Team Status Ellis reviewed team status, noting the addition of a CSP consultant to help define and support a “New Customer Implementation” role, and assist in transition from project-run to production network. Ellis also noted that a replacement for Margo Burnett is under consideration, to focus on outward-facing Public Relations.		
J. Ross	State of the Network Jason presented multiple graphs representing network uptime and utilization. The intent of the presentation was to provide the Advisory Group with an overview of what is network status data is available. Jason asked for inputs and suggestions to be forwarded to him via email. Significant discussion ensued regarding what level of information is required, how to provide it, and who the target audience(s) would be. Jason noted that the graphs portray a 99.99% uptime goal and accomplishment even though the nwMD stated SLA is currently lower.	Richard Rose asked how many State agencies participating and whether agencies terminate their former ISP service on connecting to networkMaryland. Jason noted that approximately 30% of State agencies are participating. Barb Pivec requested a list of entities using or in the pipeline to use nwMD. ACTION - Provide the list of entities using nwMD and in the pipeline to use nwMD to Members Barb noted that Eastern Shore is intent on implementing their own high-speed connections in 90 days if nwMD isn’t yet ready. Ellis noted that nwMD has a PoP and an OC3 ready for connection in Easton. Barb noted that she would be meeting with the Council and would gather more information.	Complete

		<p>Mike McCarty asked if the Advisory Group would be able to see a trend of increased users on graph at the end of the year. Mike suggested that the information be centered around the core and provide a view of performance, growth, and available resources.</p> <p>Chuck Bristow asked how planned outages are handled and whether outages were incorporated into the graphs. Jason responded that they were not yet incorporated. Mary Ann added that current maintenance windows are 11pm-5am every night, to be trimmed as oncoming customer requirements dictate.</p> <p>Mike McCarty discussed maintenance windows of 11:00 pm – 5:00 am doesn't always meet the needs of hospitals whose traffic picks up on weekend nights. Mike also suggested that nwMD not allow customers to dictate its maintenance windows beyond a certain point to avoid adversely affecting network operations.</p> <p>Chuck Bristow suggested verbage in the service level agreements that in the case of minor outages, an e-mail would suffice but if a major outage, phone calls would work best.</p> <p>ACTION – Place graphs on the working website for review and comment by the Advisory Group.</p>	Complete
M Slack	<p>Status of Project</p> <p>Mary Ann presented a status on Network Buildout:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ final splicing at Frederick, Hagerstown this month ▪ equipment purchase for Western MD this month ▪ FiberGate- CP to Frederick ready for testing ▪ SHA still reviewing Annapolis spur design; AA County collaboration still underway <p>Managed Services Contract (replacing NMS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved BPW 7/2/03; transition begins 7/24/03 	<p>Barb Pivec asked where PoPs were planned on the Eastern Shore.</p> <p>Ellis stated that he would like to get Chesapeake College and Easton Memorial on board by early fall</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awarded to CSC • 24x7x365 network OA&M • Engineering support to migrate customers • Fiber repair and management • Engineering design support • Does not include hardware purchases or construction <p>PSC Ruling – letter ready for Chip’s review</p>	<p>Ellis noted that the letter for the PSC would be given to Chip for review on 7/16 and that there is no “intent” of networkMaryland becoming a common carrier</p>	
R. Rose	<p>Baltimore POP Consortium</p> <p>Richard provided status on Baltimore Education POP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OC-48 tested and turned over 7/14/03; signed off and will open by 7/18 if City hands off fiber. • Now has collaboration of 7 peering groups • Huge impact on higher education 	<p>Tim Kwong asked approximately how much the project is expected to save the University. Richard noted that if purchased independently, the configuration would have cost \$1.5m per year.</p>	
R. Winsky	<p>HB 697</p> <p>Renee provided a status on the Economic Development Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointments Office is collecting resumes for Chair of Task Force • TEDCO has internally developed a draft plan for the Task Force’s first meeting 		
J. Ross	<p>NetworkMaryland User’s Group</p> <p>Jason proposed initiating a “hands on” technical users’ group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be run by some entity other than DBM • Seeking a chairperson for the group • Wireless infrastructure would be represented • Purpose would be co-op problem solving and information sharing. 	<p>Barb Pivec requested clarification on the purpose of the new group to ensure that it didn’t duplicate other initiatives. Several Members provided clarifying comments regarding the proposed group’s role with respect to other groups.</p> <p>Pat Wallace noted the huge benefit Sailor has seen from its users’ group.</p> <p>Richard Rose, Dick Aldridge, Jem Pagan and Stuart</p>	

		<p>Ragland (in absentia) volunteered to help. It was also suggested that Lou LaRicci may be able to provide insight in setting up a users' group.</p> <p>Rob Dallas suggested that stakeholders could present updates on their areas of technology. He also suggested that NASTD would help set this up and that Marconi would contribute.</p> <p>Motion was made, seconded and approved to form such a group.</p>	
M. Slack	<p>Comments from Public Jason commented that it was a good suggestion to have presentations from the public.</p> <p>Ellis mentioned that upcoming RFP's from DBM would include new, more company-friendly terms and conditions.</p>		
	<u>Public meeting adjourned</u>		
G. McKibbin	<p>ITAC Working Group Report: Greg McKibbin presented the status of the ITAC working group.</p> <p>The group is developing a report to serve as a Strategic Plan for migration to networkMaryland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocol standards to be common denominator • Lessons learned by current customers • Agency requirements being collected/validated • Assumptions regarding JCR language and status report due end of calendar year from DBM <p>Greg noted how heartened he was to hear the network's progress, having just recently become involved in it.</p>		
W. Morrow	Engineering Committee		

	<p>Will Morrow discussed activity at the last Engineering Committee meeting.</p> <p>Johns Hopkins personnel attended Engineering Committee meeting, providing more detailed discussion on their JHARS system and offered support IP services</p> <p>Will noted that large agencies may be able to utilize the JHARS system for IP migration and management, but it did not seem that nwMD could benefit.</p> <p>Business requirements were discussed – the Engineering Committee needs to possibly add to requirements.</p>	<p>Business requirements-any requirements by the Committee will be forwarded to Kris Shelor for inclusion in the current State agency requirements gathering.</p> <p>Mike McCarty suggested having representatives from other groups. It was noted that the Wireless Infrastructure Committee is now represented on the networkMaryland Engineering Committee and vice versa.</p> <p>Barb Pivec asked what the charters of the different groups are? Do they have overlapping purposes and is information permeating all the groups?</p> <p>Richard noted that Barb should set up a meeting with one of the primary dissenters on the Eastern Shore to try to get them on-board.</p> <p>Ellis noted that we must ensure that different groups are not redundant. How do we avoid stovepipes and vacuum? Ellis is not ready to tackle this until he has a clearer picture.</p>	
P. Wallace	<p>Bylaws & Policy Committee</p> <p>Pat Wallace reviewed the networkMaryland Charter and Bylaws document changes:</p>	<p>Mary Ann suggested that the Advisory Group not convene in August to reduce conflicts with vacations</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old mission and responsibilities replaced with new approved at June meeting • Added text to bring to 2003 • Deleted old Task Forces but retained section • Deleted Requirements, Communications committees • Removed annual meeting statement • Added status reporting responsibility for nwMD PM <p>The Group needs to review and comment on changes for discussion and vote next Advisory Group meeting</p>	<p>and other scheduled activity. Motion was made, seconded and approved to skip the August meeting.</p> <p>Pat requested comments and changes to be sent to her via email by July 31.</p>	
M. McCarty	<p>Stakeholder Collaboration</p> <p>Since the JHARS collaboration status had been provided, Mike McCarty proposed his desire to run a pilot on networkMaryland for hospitals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot to look at image data. Hospitals would assume the cost of connection • Johns Hopkins would act in a consulting capacity • 	<p>Ellis stated that he didn't want to wait until the PSC ruling to begin looking at a pilot. Mike will contact the hospitals.</p> <p>It was noted that the Rural Forum to be held in Annapolis in October would be a good place to kick off a pilot.</p>	
M. Slack E. Kitchen	<p>FY05 Capital Budget</p> <p>Mary Ann presented the proposed FY05 capital buildout for networkMaryland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed networkMaryland expansion to connect 10-12 multi-service centers around the State • introduce voice traffic • where feasible, align with State agency business requirements being collected <p>Expected cost for the planned expansion is ~\$2M. Due to cost reductions realized by the network redesign, no new capital funds are required; existing prior years' funding will be used.</p>		
M. Slack	<p>Other Business</p>	<p>Mike McCarty asked if there was activity on developing a networkMaryland Strategic Plan. Ellis noted that that task was his and that he would provide more status at the next meeting.</p>	

		ACTION – Provide progress status on Strategic Plan at September meeting.	
	Adjournment The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.		

Minutes Recorded By:
Joanne Rusk